DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 241 217 RC 014 635

AUTHOR Hill, L. Brooks; Lujan, Philip
TITLE ANARAP and the Future of Native American Studies.
PUB DATE 16 Nov 80
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention (New York, NY, November 16, 1980).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Historical Materials (060) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Alaska Natives; *American Indians; *American Indian Studies; *Databases; *Data Collection; Federal Indian Relationship; Hawaiians; Human Resources; Natural Resources; *Program Administration; Research; Research Methodology; *Research Problems
IDENTIFIERS *Administration Native American Res Analysis Proj

ABSTRACT

Funded in 1979, the Administration for Native American Research Analysis Project (ANARAP), had three primary objectives: (1) to create a computerized data base of the past decade of research about Native Americans (including American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Hawaii natives), especially research concerning natural and human resource development; (2) to determine major trends, gaps, and weaknesses in Native American research; and (3) to create an information system about Native American research through the development of an interpersonal network of interested parties, the beginning of "The Journal of Native American Studies," and the exhibition of ANARAP's data base at conferences. The project revealed three goals for Native American studies programs in the 1980's: (1) research must become a primary concern for students in Native American programs; (2) communication must be a more vital part of the education of students in Native American programs; and (3) Native American studies programs should assume the role of mediator and translator of academic research for their broader ethnic community. To accomplish these goals, Native American studies programs must overcome a growing anti-intellectual and anti-research orientation in the Native American community. The report urges a collaboration between academia and ethnic studies. (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED241217

FEB 1984
RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

ANARAP AND THE FUTURE OF NATIVE AMERICAN STUDIES

by

L. Brooks Hill and Philip Lujan*

The acronym ANARAP signifies the Administration for Native Americans Research Analysis Project; those words identify the source of funding and basic thrust of our project and this paper. ANA is an administrative subdivision of the Office of Human Development Services which is located within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Its particular function is to fund projects designed to strengthen the development of Indian tribal government. Our Research Analysis Project has been characterized as "research about research about Native Americans within the past decade" -- a characterization tailored by a government critic's wit. However, it not only aptly characterizes the project, but also portends the increasingly unmanageable explosion of recent Native American research. Although research is a major concern of governmental, academic, and Native American people, it has primarily consisted of uncoordinated efforts which have generated largely inaccessible data: in the case of federal agencies, data inaccessible to other agencies; in the case of academic disciplines, data inaccessible to other disciplines; in the case of tribes, data inaccessible to other tribes and sometimes even to the subject tribe; and thus, overall, research generally inaccessible to all but the original researcher. This uncoordinated unavailability of research is the focal point of ANARAP.

Funded as a joint submission by the Americans for Indian Opportunity and the Department of Communication and Native American Studies Program at the University of Oklahoma, ANARAP

*Both authors are on the faculty of the University of Oklahoma. Brooks Hill (Ph.D., University of Illinois, 1968) is a Professor of Communication. Philip Lujan (J.D., University of New Mexico, 1974) is Director of Native American Studies and Assistant Professor of Communication. Paper was presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, New York, New York, November 16, 1980.

RC014635

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Leslie Brooks Hill
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

recognizes the growing need for the cooperative efforts of Native American organizations and academic disciplines. Beyond this primary thrust, this project has also enhanced the natural relationship of intercultural communication and Native American Studies[1] and has fostered the development of academic goals which intensify the relationship of Native American Studies and research. Consideration of our research project, therefore, urges discussion of the goal of Native American Studies as a mediator and translator of research efforts of the various academic disciplines, a particularly important concern as these programs transition into the 1980's. This discussion also suggests the oncoming decade may be the age of true collaboration of ethnic studies and academia. The purpose, therefore, of this paper is to provide a brief description of the project, to posit possible transitional goals of Native American Studies into the 1980's, and to suggest a rationale for future cooperative efforts between ethnic studies and academia.

The Research Analysis Project[2]

In recent years the thrust of federal policy regarding Native Americans has shifted from government determination to increased tribal determination of policy and action. Public Law 93-638 symbolizes this shift and encourages local initiative. This transition now invites Native Americans to articulate and implement much of their own policy. However, their efforts are severely hampered by the unavailability, incomprehensibility, or non-adaptability of available research and hard data to guide their planning. These intimidating and frustrating conditions necessitate better systematization, interpretation, and dissemination of the vast and growing amounts of research subsidized annually by private organizations, academic institutions, and federal, state, and tribal governments.

The evolution of federal governmental Native American policy, accompanied by the broad national interest in cultural pluralism, has led to burgeoning interests in Native American research by

by diverse institutions. Their motivations are well justified by increasing concerns for human rights and the striking social and economic disadvantages of Indian groups, especially those situated in non-productive geographic areas. National statistics repeatedly point to Indian groups as sharing less in an overall picture of increasing prosperity. Scholars and practitioners from innumerable scholarly disciplines, private and public organizations have researched the perceived problems. But the products of this research are available if and only if the tribe and other interested parties are familiar with the peculiarities of research in each academic discipline and with the internal information system of the several organizations subsidizing research.

The traditional response of federal and state agencies, tribes, and academicians to tribal needs has been to generate vast amounts of information. Interested parties operate under the assumption that any situation is soluble if we only know enough about it and other similar circumstances. Information is clearly of significant potential use, but the undifferentiated, undirected tide of current interest often remains fallow, rather than contributing to a well-conceived, well-articulated, and well-organized plan of action. The critical problem is the lack of a systematic approach to information generation, rather than any inherent inefficiency associated with particular researchers or agencies.

Not only does the tribe suffer the insufficiency of apparently available information, but the general American public also suffers. From different orientations, similar or duplicatory research is often funded, costing money which could better be used on other projects or to insure complementarity of ongoing research. Perhaps the greatest cost to everyone is the failure to utilize fully the research produced. Too often research simply finds a shelf at the subsidizing organization and loses its potential for the concerned parties involved.

A specific Indian group, for example, may realize its need for information and guidance, but be unable to locate or distill

the information available. If they are sufficiently wealthy, they hire advisors to assist. These individuals typically represent the bias of their own specialty; thus, they are often unable to adapt their particular information to the exigencies of a specific situation and to adapt their guidance into the overall perspective of the tribe. The less wealthy are encouraged to accept whatever is available whether appropriate or not. Unfortunately, advice at whatever cost too often comes to the tribal governing bodies in an indigestible form which intimidates decision makers, frustrating rather than facilitating policy.

More Native American awareness of available knowledge could assist academic researchers with a "self-correction" function. That is to say, researchers typically operate from the bias of their discipline and as they approach their research projects tend to impose their specific perspective on the subjects and data. Were the Native Americans more knowledgeable about available research and information from various perspectives, fidelity to the data and adaptation to the uniqueness of tribal situations would be easier. A bridge between diverse academic perspectives would also become more likely. These patterns of mutual assistance could correct imprudent analogies between Native American tribes and other minorities, avoid "rediscovery of the wheel," and lead to mutually beneficial researcher-subject relations.[3]

More specifically, enthusiastic researchers often pose problems for tribal leaders. On the one hand, tribes are frequently approached by investigators who wish to conduct research. To address these concerns, some tribes, such as the Zuni and Navajo, have already established committees to screen and approve research projects. The results of this study would substantially help them in this task, particularly to urge the researchers to better meet tribal needs and avoid unnecessary duplication. On the other hand, more affluent tribes are beginning to sponsor research. For these tribes our study can provide guidance in the formulation and selection of projects and competent researchers.

Assistance to Native Americans is obviously the primary concern of this project. However, the results of this study also have great potential for the academic world, the government, and the private sector. For the academic community an important potential is the prioritization of needs for research; to this end the study can identify gaps in our existing knowledge and direction for study. Further, the cumulative result of this project can begin to accomplish for social studies the synthesis of the information characteristic of the physical sciences. To speak of theory may seem premature, but a well formulated conceptualization of what we know may lead to a useful "middle-range" theory[4] which may ultimately facilitate the integration of knowledge of Native Americans into a unified perspective on social action adaptable to the various other social scientific theories.

Although the idea is modest in comparison, an additional contribution of this study is the increased usefulness of "free" research. Regardless of funding pattern, academic study will continue to investigate Native American tribes and problems. For example, a specific doctoral dissertation may have little or no dissemination or utilization of its findings. The results of this research could complement other studies and build toward larger insights than single isolated findings. Unfortunately these studies are often viewed as assignments prerequisite for a degree, and their broader social value neglected. Were these studies, as well as other unfunded academic studies, synthesized, they might accumulate valuable generalizations.

Both the Executive and Congressional branches of the federal government have long recognized the fragmentary nature of available information regarding Native Americans. For example, a National Council on Indian Opportunity was established several years ago to facilitate coordination of programs in the various agencies, but ultimately dissolved; they realized a continued need, but were unable to complete their mission, because, among other reasons, of a lack of hard data regarding available research. Cumulative information could have provided the

necessary guidance to assist their efforts. The results of this study will provide the kind of synthesis upon which advisors may guide planning and implementation of policies, the screening and sponsoring of further research, and increased cooperation not only between agencies but also with tribal government. Similarly, the private sector could also benefit from this study. Each year money is channeled into many projects designed to assist minority groups. The administration of granting foundations and agencies need to know how to help. More specifically, they need to know what gaps exist and how to guide research toward critical needs of Native Americans.

Operating from the rationale developed in the preceeding pages, the specific objectives of ANARAP are threefold. Our first objective was to identify, review, abstract, catalog and cross-classify the past decade of research concerning Native Americans, including American Indians, Alaskan and Hawaiian natives. We have focused generally on that research which is concerned with human and natural resource development. The most pressing need in dealing with current information is simply to determine what is available, its nature, source, focus, approach, and findings. Appendix A provides the format by which data are accumulated and programmed into the computer system. This portion of our project is approximately 80% complete and functional.

Our second objective has two interrelated parts: First, we will determine major trends in this research. Because of the voluminous nature of Native American research, very little is known about general themes and topics which have played an important role in the field. Second, given knowledge of major trends and themes, we will then determine significant gaps and weaknesses. We suspect that gaps and deficiences, wherever they exist, are not so much the fault of researchers or agencies as they are of more general problems of organization and evaluation of the whole body of literature. Results of this portion of the study will be available by June, 1981.

Data concerning Native Americans, even if well organized and analyzed, are of little use if generally unavailable to potential users. Our third objective is to create an information system which is not only sophisticated in its organizational and analytical capacity, but one which is also imminently usable even by the layman. To facilitate maximum utilization of our system, we are first establishing an interpersonal network of liaisons from tribes, tribal groups, academia, government, foundations, and other interested parties. Second, our project will launch a new journal, The Journal of Native American Studies, to insure continuity and distribution of our results. Finally, exhibitions and demonstrations at regional and national conferences of tribal leaders and government agencies will commence in January, 1981; these will provide "hands-on" experience with our system.

Merrick Computing Center and the Department of Communication Research Laboratory at the University of Oklahoma will provide the hardware for our storage and retrieval system. Central to this system is GIPSY, a General Information Processing System, which will facilitate our systemization and ultimate dissemination and utilization of the results.[5] QUESTRAN (Question Translator), the retrieval language of GIPSY, is a non-procedural language implemented with the user in mind. The language is of a macro type, consisting of commands to control the program modules, and parameters which initiate specific operations. It was designed to have as few syntactical restrictions as possible in order to retain a clear, logical and concise structure. Experience has proven that a non-computer-oriented person, familiar with a particular subject area, can begin to get useful answers within 15-30 minutes using the simple command structure of QUESTRAN.

In summary, ANARAP began with a request for proposal from ANA during the early months of 1978. Given the unique assets and situation of Oklahoma University, we decided to respond. After

extensive review and negotiation we were awarded the contract beginning June 1, 1979. Currently in our second year of funding, the bulk of the preliminary work has been completed, and we are now very anxious to begin the "fun" parts -- analyzing the results and using the system. Our experiences to date are very exciting, and the real potential of the system is now beginning to materialize.

Future Prospects for Native American Research

The remainder of the paper will address aspects of Native American research that have resulted from or are implied by ANARAP. Because the project was an integral part of the Native American Studies program at Oklahoma University, it has compelled re-consideration of the program goals: First, no longer is research a secondary or peripheral concern of our program and curriculum. if our students are to succeed, they must understand, utilize, and/or produce research. Second, communication, or lack thereof, has surfaced as one of the most salient concerns for the success of students in Native American Studies.[6] These concerns are vital to the future of the program in the academic community and for the resolution of problems in the broader Native American communities. We also believe that these goals can be generalized to other Native American Programs and perhaps ethnic studies in general.

Ethnic studies programs currently face a crucial transition period. The decade of the 1960's provided the philosophical and political impetus for program establishment and was sufficient to propel the programs through the 1970's -- at times, however, only barely sufficient. These programs now face a time when the environment has altered, and student concerns are far removed from the 1960's. The management and translation of research represents an opportunity for ethnic studies to assert themselves more legitimately in the forefront of a growing and reciprocally beneficial relationship between researchers and ethnic communities.[7] With improved academic integrity and substantive contributions,

Native American studies can command the respect so important to their success; indeed, they may further help to correct some perplexing research problems which current ethnocentricity obscures.[8]

With this shifting emphasis in goals, ethnic studies can counter a growing anti-intellectual and anti-research trend. Manifesting this trend, ethnic or minority communities have recently begun to witness an increasing resistance to research. A major reason for this resistance is the general unavailability and incomprehensibility of research. This, however, is not the only reason. As we have discovered, minority communities themselves are developing a greater sophistication concerning the philosophical underpinnings of research; this development is partially a result of educated minority members who have begun to question the presumptions of research, and other researchers who have begun to exhibit more sensitivity and caution about the nature of their work.

Unfortunately, we have also begun to see the effect of minority academics who, for personal reasons or peer pressure of their group, express an uncritical, wholesale rejection of all research as culturally biased and therefore worthless. These disenchanted academics argue that we substitute Western philosophical and scientific paradigms for those of the particular minority. This seductive substitution, whether real or imagined, may be a legitimate focal point for the study of minority groups, and its consideration may resolve some serious research problems more generally; however, it should not force the disregard of honest research and the cultivation of an anti-intellectual orientation. This wholesale rejection could be psychologically and sociologically comforting to educational minority members, who may feel the greatest sting of perceived and real alienation from their groups, but it will not aid the long-term evaluation of research and the generation of realistic strategies of minority survival.

More pressing than the seduction by paradigm, is a very realistic intercultural question: If we acknowledge the economic interdependence of the ethnic minority and overculture, how

can we develop realistic strategies for successful interaction with the overculture within the context of their paradigms and orientations? Here the impact of ethnic studies as a translator and mediator of the ethnic experience to the dominant society clearly emerges: Ethnic studies is in a potentially excellent position to mediate the impact of the seductive paradigms upon their minority members, as well as to identify, translate, and guide research by academics.[9]

Most ethnic studies programs have developed and maintained contact with their constituent communities. Indeed, one of the major goals of Native American Studies for the 1980's is the expansion and intensification of relationship with their broader ethnic community. Many of these ethnic communities, particularly Native American, do not really desire anything like "truth" about themselves to emerge. They have often confounded research by deliberately misleading researchers. For some, it is an obligation to provide misleading and distorted data.[10] This resistance to research is particularly frustrating, because researchers often never know that "they've been had." In fact, a researcher may never know, and others may use the data erroneously to generate strategies and further research. Often, later researchers will expose the error, but this and succeeding researchers are also vulnerable to the same deception.

Two particularly important attitudes among Native Americans must be addressed in countering the resistance to research. The first may be characterized as the currently faddish "HEW mindset" about minorities, a mindset with focus on the establishment of the uniqueness of particular minority groups. Whether or not one might cynically attribute this to competitive efforts in the justification of proposals for federal funding, suffice it to say that many people, minorities and Anglos alike, have a vested interest in such a viewpoint. On the one hand, this may be a sucessful "gamesmanship" strategy for research funding, and without federal money most research would not be done; it is another thing, however, to let funding strategy dictate approaches

to social problems generated by intercultural conflict.[11] The net effect of the "HEW mindset" is that studies emphasize and produce empirical "proofs" of differences which serve to justify funding for more studies that seek further uniqueness and solutions predicated on this "uniqueness." As Sam Deloria, Director of the American Indian Law Center, has wryly observed, "Indians unique themselves out of existence, so that nothing applies to them."[12] We are not saying there are no substantive differences; there are. However, such undue emphasis on "uniqueness" cannot help but skew well meaning attempts to aid minority adjustments. Further, we are not implying here that such attempts do not begin with "good" motivations. We are, instead, talking about balance. The sad truth is that we do not know the ways in which minority groups in this country are similar to the dominant culture, we do not know the ways in which they are unique, and finally we do not know how the interplay between these two conditions affects intercultural interaction and intracultural development. With Native Americans, for instance, we do not know if Native American communication behavior is the result of a generalized minority reaction to the dominant culture, a product of a unique Indian cultural attribute, or some combination of the two which may attain the significance of a "third culture" developed for the interaction alone.[13]

A less cynical result of the "uniqueness" research is the focus on psychological needs of minority groups themselves; unfortunately, the same research which generates the concerns also fosters the problem. Minority groups experience a great deal of insecurity concerning their identity as a group. Perhaps the dominant culture is confident in its categorizations of individual group membership, but individual minority members themselves are not so casual. Acceptance by the group and its demands for appropriate behavior often conflict diametrically with the demands of the dominant culture for success and the "good life."[14] This problem is often heightened to the point of neurosis for minority members educated at the doctoral level,

a level deemed sufficiently trustworthy to administer "legitimate" research by institutions of the dominant society. For example, observations at national meetings of Native Americans reveal an almost neurotic preoccupation with the establishment of "Indianess." not only in appearance (conglomerations of beadwork, feathers, and the like disproportionately mixed indiscriminately to constitute impropriety in a tribal context) but also in use of slang and exaggerated mannerisms. There is something substantive about such feelings of anxiety that provoke behavior ranging from the bizarre to vague feelings of insecurity. These adjustment problems reflect a serious dilemma as Native Americans use social science research to establish their uniqueness.

A second attitude suggests the inadequacy of social sciences to make a valid contribution because they are culture bound. Despite attempts to be objective, our social sciences do contain many assumptions of Western culture. Even if it is culture bound and subjective, practical considerations ultimately outweigh the philosophical niceties of belabouring its shortcomings. The social sciences may simply be the most reliable game going, and we need the most objective analytical means available to define and provide an analytical framework for the development of intervention strategies. This line of reasoning may beg some ultimate questions temporarily, but it can permit Indians a more vital role in the generation of useful information, prudently qualified. Ultimately, it may serve as a translator of Indian experience into an academic context, may increase the understanding of academics, and may decrease traditional resistance to new concepts of research by all parties involved. At least, with this approach it will not be necessary to pioneer a "purely Indian" approach to research--an approach which may discard both good and bad within current research.

The traditional social science approach can also allow an emphasis on the commonality of experience which is shared by minority groups in relation to the dominant culture. In the past we have noted a hesitancy by Native Americans to accept research

which identifies commonality. However, no realistic and helpful long-term strategy can be formulated upon an approach that for doctrinaire reasons eliminates such commonalities. Especially significant is the commonalities shared with Blacks, Chicanos and other physically identifiable minorities and, more subtly, those commonalities shared with non-physically identifiable minorities. We do not know, for instance, how much the behavior of a Native American in an intercultural situation can be attributed directly to Native American culture traits, how much to a minority reaction in general, and how much to being physically different in a perceived homogenous group. Recognition and acceptance of research focused on commonalities shared by ethnic minorities could address some of the questions.

The most significant contribution of a research-oriented approach to Native American studies, however, is that it provides a definition of the role of non-Indian people in working with Native Americans. There has been much confusion and agony between non-Indians and Indians over this issue. However, non-Indians sensitive to Indian issues are able to provide their expertise and assistance in a relatively objectified manner. They, as non-Indians, are not telling Indians what it means to be Indian; they are describing and analyzing Indian interaction within a given intercultural context. If behavior is ascribed a negative function, it is not done in any ultimate sense, but rather contextually. Their contribution will be the identification and categorization of behavior patterns that negatively affect success in coping with the dominant society. To be helpful, this must necessarily reflect all the inherent assumptions of the Anglo culture. It does not matter how Indians may define something like classroom reticence; it matters, instead, how Anglos define reticence. Where do our school teachers come from? What is the rationale for a university education? What are the built-in presumptions in the subjective grading system? Anglos grade minorities; Anglo assumptions provide the criteria which fail minorities. Therefore, minorities need to know more about

the dominant culture's presumptions about minorities. This is not a pleasant subject for Indian educators who speak so grandly, but all too vaguely, about Indian teachers in the Indian classroom teaching Indian curriculum. How practical is this suggestion? Do we have even a reasonable chance of accomplishing this even within the next decade?[15] To address these questions requires research by Indians, as well as non-Indians, and to condemn work simply because it is non-Indian is a sad display of minority myopia.

Conclusion

This paper briefly reported a major research project abbreviated ANARAP. Using this report as a point of departure, we examined several results and implications of our project for Native American Studies and research in the 1980's. Three general goals for Native American Studies began to surface: (1) Research must become a primary concern for students in these programs; (2) communication must become a more vital part of their education; and (3) Native American Studies should assume the role of mediator and translator of academic research for their broader ethnic community. To accomplish these goals will require us to overcome a growing anti-intellectual and anti-research orientation operating in the Native American community. Together, ANARAP and the reconceptualization of Native American Studies suggested herein may lead to a true collaboration of academia and these ethnic studies in the challenging decade of the 1980's.

END NOTES

[1]For an expanded discussion of this see Philip Lujan and L. Brooks Hill, "Intercultural Communication As an Academic Haven For Ethnic Studies Programs: Perspectives for the 1980's," paper presented at Speech Communication Association Convention, New York, New York, Nov. 14, 1980.

[2]Portions of this section were drawn from the original proposal prepared by the co-authors and William R. Carmack, Professor of Communication at Oklahoma University.

[3]For an elaboration of this see Vern L. Bengston, et al, "Relating Academic Research to Community Concerns: A Case Study in Collaborative Effort," Journal of Social Issues, XXXIII, no. 4 (1977), 75-93.

[4]Everett Rogers and F. Floyd Shoemaker, Communication of Innovations: A Cross-cultural Approach (2nd ed., New York: Free Press, 1971), pp. 85-95.

[5]GIPSY is a currently working and proven system. The system is now operational at the U. S. Geological Survey (The Department of Interior, Washington, D. C.) which utilizes GIPSY to process bibliographic data, project files, and personnel files. The University of Missouri, Medical Center; Texas Institute of Research and Rehabilitation, Houston, Texas; and the Kaiser-Permanente Hospital, Oakland, California, utilize it to analyze patient records. At the University of Oklahoma, GIPSY provides the primary systems support in projects concerned with Regional Planning information, Oil information, Legislative Research, Psychiatric record analysis, Palynological data, Educational and Geologic Bibliographic files. Most recently, the Energy Resource Administration, in a contract analagous to the current proposal, has arranged for the University and GIPSY to establish a repository and system for dissemination and utilization of energy-related research.

[6]See Lujan and Hill.

[7]For an extensive discussion see Joseph E. Trimble, "The Sojourner in the American Indian Community: Methodological Issues and Concerns," Journal of Social Issues, XXXIII, no. 4 (1977), 159-174.

[8]For an elaboration of this see William R. Kennan and L. Brooks Hill, "Mythmaking As Social Process: Directions for Myth Analysis and Cross Cultural Communication Research," Intercultural Theory and Practice, ed. by William M. Davey (Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University and SIETAR, 1979), pp. 55-59.

[9]See Clara Sue Kidwell, "Native American Studies: Academic Concerns and Community," American Indian Culture and Research Journal, II, nos. 3-4 (1978), 7.

[10]See Trimble.

[11]For an extended discussion see William Carmack, "The Status of Research in Planned Change," Intercultural Theory and Practice, op. cit., pp. 87-96.

[12]This quote was obtained in a telephone conversation between Philip Lujan and Sam Delcria on March 17, 1980. The conversation concerned the particular fascination that the Indian community has with uniqueness.

[13]A more complete conceptualization can be obtained in Huber W. Ellingsworth, "Conceptualizing Intercultural Communication," Communication Yearbook, Vol. I, Edited by Ruben (I.C.A., 1977); and L. Brooks Hill and William R. Kennan, "Ethnomethodology and Intercultural Communication Study," paper presented at the Southern Speech Association Convention, Biloxi, Mississippi, April 13, 1979.

[14]For elaboration of this idea see: L. Brooks Hill and Philip Lujan, "Cultural Pluralism: Implications from the Native Americans of North America," paper presented at the SIETAR convention, Mexico City, Mexico, March 8, 1979.

[15]The American Indian Policy Review Commission, authorized by Congress to investigate Indian problems, provides some sobering statistics concerning the number of Indian students located within the various American educational institutions. Among these, the public school system predominates. See American Indian Policy Review Commission, Final Report, submitted to Congress May 17, 1977, Two Volumes, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1977. The Task Force on Community Services dealt with education as a specific issue.

APPENDIX A

*FORM=ANARAP	(FORM)
*ACCESSION NUMBER:	(ACCESS)
AUTHOR (S):	(AUTHOR)
INSTITUTION:	(INSTIT)
TITLE:	(TITLE)
JOURNAL CITATION:	(JCITE)
*DATES:	
PUBLICATION:	(PDATE)
DATA GATHERED:	(DDATE)
*FUNDING SOURCE AND REPOSITORY::	
FUNDING SOURCE:	(FSOURCE)
REPOSITORY AND/OR PUBLISHER:	(RPUB)
DOCUMENT NUMBER:	(DOC)
PAGES:	(PAGES)
*KEYWORDS:	
TRIBES OR COMMUNITY:	(TRIBE)
RESERVATION OR SPECIFIC OFF-RESERVATION OR URBAN:	(RESV)
LOCATION:	(LOCAT)
DESCRIPTORS:	(DESCR)
*NATURE OF STUDY:	
TYPE:	(TYPE)
N SIZE:	(SIZE)
*ABSTRACT:	(ABSTR)